

APR 26 1941

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL 34, NO. 21

April 21, 1941

WHOLE NO. 921

1941 SUMMER LINGUISTIC INSTITUTE

REVIEWS

ROBINSON, SORRELL, *Latinum (Latta)*; THOMPSON, *Ancient Libraries (Boyce)*; VIERECK, ROOS, *Appianus, Historia Romana 1 (Dunkel)*; NOLTE, *Augustins Freundschaftsideal in seinen Briefen (Sister Mary Bernard)*; KENYON, *Bible and Archaeology (Ingholt)*; BERNHEIMER, CARPENTER, KOFFKA, NAHM, *Art (Hovey)*; EBY, ARROWOOD, *History and Philosophy of Education, Ancient and Medieval (Guinagh)*; SVENSSON, *Wiener Handschrift zu Xenophons Anabasis (Clough)*; GRAY, *Foundations of Language (Kent)*

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

Just Published—

GREEK POPULAR RELIGION

BY MARTIN P. NILSSON

*The fullest account to date of the
dynamic religion of ancient Greece*

\$2.50

Remember also—

THE ROMAN'S WORLD

by Frank Gardner Moore

\$3.75

GREEK LIFE AND THOUGHT

by La Rue Van Hook

\$2.50

Write for full information

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS · MORNINGSIDE HEIGHTS · NEW YORK

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor; Jotham Johnson, Associate Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Penna.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, 418 South Wycombe Avenue, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Eugene W. Miller, Norman T. Pratt, Bluma L. Trell, Edna White.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 34 contains issues dated: October 7, 14, 21, 28; November 4, 18; December 2, 9, 16 (1940); January 6, 13, 20; February 10, 24; March 3, 10, 17, 24, 31; April 14, 21, 28; May 5, 12, 19; June 2 (1941).

ANNUAL MEETING

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON

APRIL 25 & 26

1941 SUMMER LINGUISTIC INSTITUTE

With European study now out of the question it is evident that special summer institutes will take on still more significance for the American student and scholar. The Summer Institute sponsored by the Linguistic Society of America has become an annual affair, and it is expected to continue yearly without interruption. For the past five years it was held on the campus of the University of Michigan where it attracted language students from all sections of the country, but where it served particularly as a focal point for linguistic study in the region of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi Valley. Now it has been shifted to the South Atlantic region and it is hoped that it will serve a similar purpose there.

For this first summer at the University of North Carolina, the Institute has expanded its program. There will be thirty courses under the direction of seventeen scholars from June 12 to July 19. E. H. Sturtevant of Yale University will give the Introduction to Linguistic Science and an advanced seminar in the Hittite laryngeals. R. G. Kent of the University of Pennsylvania, who is president of the Society this year, will present Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin, and a course in Lithuanian. George S. Lane of the University of North Carolina, whose article on Tocharian was recently enjoyed by readers of CLASSICAL WEEKLY (34:194-9), will conduct a course in Tocharian (the first course in this language to be taught in America), another in Gothic, and one in Old Norse. The eminent Celticist Myles Dillon of the University of Wisconsin, formerly of Dublin, will present both Irish and Welsh.

Franklin Edgerton of Yale University will give both elementary and advanced Sanskrit. An innovation will be the lecture course by Dr. Y. R. Chao, who is in this country on the invitation of the American Council of Learned Societies. Dr. Chao will give a series of nine lectures, two hours each, on the linguistic structure of Chinese for those who do not have a previous knowledge of the language. Ephraim A. Speiser will be the professor of Semitics for the session; he will give elementary Akkadian and a course in Comparative Semitic Grammar.

For those students whose interest lies in English and American speech, there will be, first of all, the practical courses on the American Dialect Atlas, offered by Hans Kurath of Brown University, who is the director of work on the Atlas. He will give two courses. J. Milton Cowan of the University of Iowa, Secretary and Treasurer of the Linguistic Society, will conduct the phonetics laboratory where emphasis will be put upon recording. E. E. Ericson will teach Old English grammar and an historical survey of modern English. Richard Jente will give a course in Middle High German. For American Indian linguistics the professor will be Dr. Morris Swadesh of the federal Indian service in Mexico. He will be assisted by Dr. Raven McDavid, Jr. of Southwestern Louisiana Institute, who will serve as anthropological consultant in connection with the two native Indian informants who will attend the Institute.

Work in Romance linguistics will be conducted by three members of the faculty of the University of

North Carolina. Urban T. Holmes, Jr., Director of the Institute, will present Old French, Old Italian and Vulgar Latin. R. W. Linker will give a course in Old Provençal, and R. S. Boggs will conduct a double course in Old Spanish.

Students and faculty will, as usual, have every opportunity for mutual cooperation. There will be a special luncheon every Thursday at which some member will lead discussion on a fixed topic. Special evening lectures will be held once a week, or oftener; several speakers will be brought to Chapel Hill for those occasions. The fourth Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society will be held July 11 and 12, with joint entertainment by the University of North Carolina and Duke University. It is expected that the papers to be presented at this meeting will attract many additional

scholars to the session. The headquarters for the Society will be the Carolina Inn.

This Institute, with such a gathering of specialists as can hardly be found in the regular session of any university, gives a unique opportunity for professional training and inspiration. A printed announcement and other necessary information will be furnished promptly to anyone who will write to the Director of the Linguistic Institute, Box 348, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. The normal load for a student will be three courses for which the student can transfer a total of six semester hours or nine quarter hours to any university in the country if he is admitted officially to the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina. The application for admission will be sent by either the Director of the Institute or the Graduate School.

REVIEWS

Latinum. A Reader for the First Stage of Latin. By C. E. ROBINSON, with illustrations by ALAN SORRELL. viii, 138 pages, 20 figures. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1940 (\$0.88)

This small book is for beginners in the study of Latin and could be used as a supplementary reader or as a basic text in the eighth or ninth grade of schools in the United States. The reading material introduced from the first lesson is mostly in the form of a well devised play based obviously on a comedy of Plautus. The author's avowed purpose in using a play form as a basis for his text is to supply interesting reading for the student through a Latin drama concerned with Roman life. To keep the plot clear an argument in English is provided for each of the three acts.

Grammatical forms and syntax are given as they appear in the text. The vocabulary is selected from words found in Latin commonly read in the schools and in view of the subject matter is astonishingly simple. Review in the form of short Latin sentences and narrative passages and English sentences and paragraphs for prose work are placed at the back of the book. Also a short section furnishes work on derivation. Frequent notes on Roman life provide explanation and background for the play. The illustrations are attractive and more satisfactory aesthetically than the usual line drawings found in Latin secondary-school textbooks. For this reason accurate archaeological detail is in some instances sacrificed for the sake of simplicity and artistry.

The book has a short introduction on language and the Roman drama. The section devoted to quantity of vowels is very short indeed and has no general information on pronunciation. Suggestions for the use of the book (11) are that the Latin should be read aloud; that forms and constructions should first be approached through the medium of the Latin text;

that the word-meanings, where possible, should be guessed; that the understanding of word-meanings and of rules should be reinforced by strict memorization.

This attractive book should prove useful and should make a place for itself in the classroom.

DOROTHY PARK LATTA

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Ancient Libraries. By JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON. 120 pages, 3 figures. University of California Press, Berkeley 1940 \$2

The growth of libraries in the ancient world and the related subjects of books and reading have fascinated many and inspired a great deal of research during the past half century. The ancient literature remaining to us has been sifted for evidence, and archaeology has revealed the ruins of several library buildings and brought to light a number of inscriptions concerning them. But we must still admit that our knowledge of ancient libraries remains most sketchy, comprised of scattered bits from which anything like a satisfactory history can be drawn only by the constant use of conjecture. The one great discovery of archaeology—the private library at Herculaneum—has proved disappointing, since it recovered for us the writings of a second-rate philosopher instead of the famous classics. When this new volume by Professor Thompson was announced, one wondered whether he could have turned up some new material. One hoped at any rate that he would have brought together in this single volume all the scattered knowledge concerning the ancient libraries. The thoroughness of his recent volume, *The Medieval Library* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1939, reviewed by F. M. Carey CW 34.4-6), led us to expect much—more in fact than the summary which his *Ancient Libraries* proves to be. That is not to say, however, that the volume will not be appreciated.

For the librarian and bibliographer and for all who

are interested in books and libraries, but not intimately acquainted with antiquity, this little work performs a real service in bringing together in convenient form material which is either not available elsewhere in English or only scattered through the pages of monographs and periodical articles. Though the author has obviously not been content to refashion the modern writings on his subject, but has repeatedly gone back to the original evidence, it cannot be said that his presentation contributes much that is new. The same ground has already been covered—and with a far greater thoroughness than the compass of this slight volume allows. Hence this is not a work of particular value to the classical scholar or the historian of antiquity. They will however make use of the bibliographical citations in the twenty pages of notes at the end of the volume.

Professor Thompson treats his subject in four chapters, the first three dealing in succession with the ancient libraries of the Near East (1-15), Greece (17-25) and Rome (27-50). The brevity of the treatment is to some degree compensated for by the extensive bibliographical citations, which lead the way to more detailed treatments and enable one to check up on both the ancient evidence and the modern literature. The last chapter comprises approximately half the volume (51-98) and is devoted to "Various technical matters": "the format of books, library architecture, cataloguing and classification, administration, book production, and bookselling."

Since this volume will be useful primarily to those not well acquainted with antiquity, it is a pity that it could not have been well illustrated. Only three poor cuts are introduced and they are inadequately labeled. The author gives no information whatever concerning the originals from which two of his sketches are taken. Yet he refers to the subject of the second of them as an important bas-relief (Note 145), but without indication that that bas-relief is illustrated in the present volume. One wonders whether the hieroglyphs that extend over five pages of the first chapter might not have been sacrificed in the interest of better and more numerous illustrations.

Two notable omissions in the account of the Greek and Roman libraries should be recorded. The all important passages from St. Isidore's *Etymologiae* (VI 3: De bibliothecis and the related topics treated in the subsequent chapters, VI 5-6, 10-14: De chartis, De pergamenis, De libris conficiendis, etc.) are nowhere mentioned. These passages are of particular value, because they represent the sole consecutive account of the subject remaining to us from antiquity (Isidore, of course, was not drawing on his own knowledge for this information, but copying out older authors), and because his account in all probability goes back to some work of Suetonius, which in turn was based on the

lost *De Bibliothecis* of Varro, the only volume known to have been devoted to the subject in all antiquity. Again, Thompson fails to give credit to the first modern writer on the subject of ancient libraries, Justus Lipsius, whose *De Bibliothecis Syntagma* (second ed., Antwerp 1607) not merely was the first account, but remains surprisingly fresh today.

It is certainly not to be wondered at that Professor Thompson, in stepping from his chosen field of the Middle Ages to antiquity, shows signs of being less at home there. Indeed the acquaintance with classical scholarship which he does demonstrate in his notes to this volume is hardly short of amazing. It is therefore not in a spirit of criticism, but by way of offering suggestions to better a second edition, that I call attention to the following small points.

The bibliography so generously cited is occasionally a little old, with superseded works cited to the exclusion of the more up-to-date. The author would have done well to mention the recent comprehensive bibliography of the whole subject of Greek and Roman libraries covering the past forty years: H. Gomoll, "Bibliographie des griechisch-römischen Bibliothekswesens, 1899-1938," in *Buch und Schrift*, N. F. 1 (1938) 96-105. Other excellent works are cited, but not in the latest editions, e.g., Note 21, Schubart, W. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*, 2. Aufl. 1921; Note 49, Milne, J. G. *History of Egypt under the Romans*, 3d ed., rev. & enl. 1924; Note 96, Judeich, W. *Topographie der Stadt Athen*, 2. vollst. neubearb. Aufl. 1931.

The following slight slips have been observed: 17 (the quotation from Aeschylus), *μαθεῖν*, not *παθεῖν*; 93, Q. Fabius Pictor, not Victor; Note 81, Kuehn, not Kuhn; Note 90, Cena Trimalchionis, not Trimalchii.

GEORGE K. BOYCE

AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME

Appianus, *Historia Romana* 1. Edited by P. VIERECK and A. G. ROOS. xxxiv, 584 pages. Teubner, Leipzig 1939 18.45 M.

Thirty-four years after the publication by Viereck of the second volume of Appian, the editors now double back in the work and give us in the Teubner series a new first volume, which supersedes Mendelssohn's edition of 1879. Mendelssohn laid a solid foundation for the textual criticism of Appian as far as the manuscripts available to him were concerned, and since his time no new evidence has been found. Furthermore, Appian, lying somewhat off the highway of Greek scholarship, has not been so popular a field for conjecture as have many authors. As a result of these circumstances, the present text shows less change from that of Mendelssohn than might normally be expected after a lapse of more than sixty years.

The most striking differences between this volume and its predecessor are two. First, in the intervening years we have gained from many different sources considerable new information about many of the matters which Appian treats. The archaeologist, the numismatist, the epigraphist and other specialists have aided the historian by illuminating or contradicting Appian's narrative. These investigations should receive consideration in any intelligent reading of the text. Consequently, to aid in this process, the editors have added at the foot of every page, notes and references which they believe will be helpful to the reader. Obviously anyone attempting to offer selected references exposes himself to criticism since no two scholars would offer identical lists. Our editors are no exceptions to the general rule, and one could easily find fault on the grounds that some of the notes and citations are too obvious to demand mention while others are too much concerned with minutiae. However, since unanimous agreement on any list could probably never be obtained and since for most readers of an author who covers such a range of time and space almost any suggestions of this sort are welcome, the editors' effort should be gratefully accepted. In any case, since changes in the text are not startling, this annotation constitutes one of the most important features of this edition.

The second difference between the volumes lies in the text itself and is the result of our greater knowledge of the language of Appian's time. By virtue of it, our editors have frequently been able to revert to what we now know is a perfectly normal reading and to reject many needless "corrections," conjectures, and suspicions. In this way, the critical apparatus has been cleared of a large amount of excess speculation. It is almost unnecessary to add that reexamination of the text has enabled the editors to correct several slips made by their predecessors in both collating and editing.

When two editors collaborate on a text which varies so widely in its nature and especially in the state of preservation of its various parts, to formulate general statements which are both true and meaningful is difficult; but the following comments make that attempt. On the whole, the edition is one which might be called conservative. The proper reversion to the manuscripts in many matters of orthography and syntax has already been noted. Other emendations have, of course, been made. Both editors contribute quite a number of conjectures, relatively few of which they receive into their text. The other new readings are chiefly Mendelssohn's conjectures which he did not incorporate into his text. In their selection of readings to be adopted, both Mendelssohn's and their own, the editors have been judicious, and the result is at very least a clearer and more readable text. In shifting sections also the editors have usually been conservative and abstained (e.g., Iber. 278); in the Italica, however, the order of the first few

fragments has been shifted, rightly. In the longer fragments of the excerpted books the sections have been broken into smaller units; Mendelssohn's numbering has, however, been added in the margin.

The editors have made every effort to render the volume useful. Running-titles in Latin at the top of each page give the general content, and the dates of events narrated are placed in the margin. When to this material are added the text, the critical apparatus, the selected references, and the chapter, page and line numbers, the result is a heavily loaded page, but a very useful one, though the many numbers may sometimes cause confusion. A preface, following for the most part the lines laid down by Mendelssohn, and an index of names are also included in the volume.

Although the reviewer conducted no special research for misprints and certainly did not check all the references, the proof readers seem to have done their work extremely well.

In brief then, the volume contains a very readable text and much helpful annotation and can probably best be characterized as extremely useful.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Augustins Freundschaftsideal in seinen Briefen. By VENANTIUS NOLTE. 124 pages. Rita, Würzburg 1939

In this volume Father Nolte attempts, and very successfully, to show from Augustine's letters his tendency to friendship at all times and the working of his soul at different periods.

The introduction points out how definitely the works of Augustine are the product of his personality. They are not mere speculations but the outgrowth of the intimate needs of the soul and his deep consciousness of duty. They testify to the varied and deep interests and tendencies of the great African.

There are three distinct stages treated in the friendship of Augustine: first, Augustine's youthful friendship in his earliest comprehension of it; second, his life of friendship in the "purifying epoch of Neo-Platonism"; third, his friendship based on Christian Charity.

In chapter one, the author with methodical skill introduces us to Augustine in his very lowest and sensual idea of friendship at Carthage, next at Milan, and then at Cassiciacum; he carries us on through the purifying epoch of Neo-Platonism, when the bonds of material affections are broken and yet remain limited and confined, to the magnificent fulfillment of love founded on Christian charity. Here no one is excluded from the circle of friends. All are loved in God, for God, that all may be led to God.

Chapter two treats Augustine's ideal of friendship

based on letters illustrating friendships formed on merely the "intellectual," on 'christiana caritas,' and on 'mutua caritas' in its narrow sense. Just how far each of these is a true friendship and why, are thoroughly discussed. From these discussions, Father Nolte draws the conclusion of what Augustine considered the essence of friendship to be; what must be the goal for all true friends. The writer shows clearly how Augustine at all times felt their need to help him to attain his last end.

Therefore, he continually seeks them out with all the ability of his soul in order that all might go more securely to God. His desire for certain friends is evident in such letters as those to Jerome. The yearning for friends he endeavors to spiritualize. He now feels bodily presence is not essential for the enjoyment of true friendship for the lack of which Augustine finds great solace in correspondence. The great doctor asserts that prayer may not be excluded from friendship because it brings about a spiritual and lasting union. So too, as he attempted to prove to Jerome, he would not exclude just praise or blame. In Eternity friendship finds its completion and receives its last consecration.

Chapter three shows the ideal of friendship in its widest sense, when Augustine strove to extend his love to all the members of the Church, the "Corpus Christi Mysticum." Christ is the head and we are the members. Charity no longer is confined to the neighbor and to each other, but to all Christendom. Augustine was everything to everybody, as various letters in this chapter show.

The conclusion reveals clearly Augustine's influence upon posterity. Euchen says that his works become the basis of a life ruled by religion and were the foundation of the culture of the Middle Ages. His ethical work particularly is valuable for many treatises on friendship written throughout the Middle Ages. All teach that "without Me (God) friendship can neither profit nor endure, nor is that love pure and true which I (God) do not bind together" (Thomas à Kempis 3, 42).

SISTER MARY BERNARD

URSULINE COLLEGE

The Bible and Archaeology. By SIR FREDERIC KENYON. 310 pages, 31 plates, 1 map. Harper & Brothers, New York and London (1940) \$3

The distinguished former Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum has in this book given a most interesting survey of the archaeological discoveries made during the last hundred years in their relation to the Bible.

After an introductory study on the nature of archaeological evidence, Sir Frederic in the following seven chapters deals with the excavations in northern Meso-

potamia and in Egypt, the Hittites, Crete and Philistia, completing the imposing array of finds by way of Syria, Palestine and Sinai. The manuscripts of the Bible, the special field of the author, form the material for the next two chapters, in which the Chester Beatty papyri and the Codex Sinaiticus naturally figure prominently. The book concludes with a discussion of the archaeological discoveries as they bear upon the composition, authority and interpretation of the Old Testament, the text and textual tradition of the New Testament.

Sir Frederic covers an enormous wealth of material in a direct and lucid style, treating the often complex problems with sober judgment and occasional delightful glimpses of humor. It is his firm contention that in studying the Bible in the light of the idea of progressive revelation, the progress of archaeological research will be found to constitute not a danger, but a steady march in the direction of establishing the essential trustworthiness of the Bible narrative.

Although Biblical scholars may disagree with the interpretation of this or that archaeological fact propounded¹, Sir Frederic's book remains an excellent summary of what Near Eastern archaeology during the last century has contributed towards a better and fuller understanding of the Bible.

HARALD INGHOLT

RIDGEWOOD, NEW JERSEY

Art: A Bryn Mawr Symposium. By RICHARD BERNHEIMER, RHYS CARPENTER, K. KOFFKA, MILTON C. NAHM. xii, 350 pages. Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr 1940 (Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs, 9) \$2.50

This valuable book records a series of lectures held by Bryn Mawr College in the Spring of 1939 on the general topic, Art. The point of view was the integration of art into the material of academic studies and in so doing to indicate not so much the limitations within each category in which art may be considered as the bearing of the work of art upon an understanding of man. Others have distinguished among the connoisseur, the art critic, the art historian. Much has been written on the nature and meaning of art but here a historian and an archaeologist, a psychologist and a philosopher, have had the common aim of each reaching through art a surer understanding of his own subject. It is pleasant to find a collaboration of this sort within our colleges, and it is a delight to discover so stimulating a presentation of speculative thought.

¹ Against the interpretation given of Terach and Negeb in the Ras Shamra poems (160), cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Berytus* 6.65f., 78, 91-3. As to the date of the fall of Jericho (180), cf. W. F. Albright, *From Stone Age to Christianity* 194.

Dr. Bernheimer in his *Defense of Representation* has well brought out the relationship between abstract and representational art. If he convinces us that "representation in art is ultimately inevitable," he has likewise shown how important are the formal relations upon which abstract art depends. His remarks on the social significance of representation are illuminating and perhaps need stating even for the critic. Particularly forceful is his emphasis on the need for the critic to distinguish this "deeper understanding" which comes from formal values in unity with content. Again in his rather involved discussion of symbols he states a task, the awareness of which is important to the Art Historian. He says this latter must learn to single out and explain those characteristics common to any one phase of expression which are really symbols of the whole conception. It is of course a further emphasis on the fact that no art form is ever repeated in quite the same way.

By far the most delightful of the series are the three sections by Rhys Carpenter who also wrote the Preface and who has ever born in mind the need for some sort of unity in so vast a subject. In his "Archaeological Approach" he reveals the dependence of the archaeologist on all categories of human thought but above all, though he cannot prove its necessity, he justifies the technical or really the archaeological method. The old dilemma in which technical evolution in art is at cross purposes with emotional values stimulates him to illuminating comment. This problem is of course discussed by Roger Fry in his essay on *Art and Society*. As a true archaeologist, however, he must follow the evidence available and this he does in a masterly way, first in connection with the evolution of sculpture as a matter of technique, and then again with equal soundness in *Modern Painting*. When he speaks of the contemporaries he becomes completely disarming. Is his statement, that the ultimate destiny of Painting is symbolism, contradictory to Bernheimer's remarks about the certain survival of representation? Probably not, but one does not quite know and that is both the charm and the annoyance of the book. Carpenter, in fact, says that the purpose of the symposium is to see how different are the various possible approaches to the single central interest.

Perhaps the most significant statement in the series from the point of view of the art historian, and from the man who organized the series, is in Professor Koffka's concluding paragraph on "Problems in Psychology," in which he says, "Thus art, psychologically considered, is not an idle play on our emotions, but a means of helping us to find our place in the world." The Psychologist may have been late in bringing his interest to bear upon art but he has now furnished the impetus for greater concern with the subject. The treatment here is excellent in summarizing the outstanding

points of view, many of which are otherwise only to be had in German, and also in indicating the importance of those new fields of endeavor which the experimental psychologist is now discovering.

The Philosopher, Milton Nahm, is no less convincing as to the importance of art to mankind. He says, "It supplies him with the energy and inspiration to continue his endless task in the control of nature." He likewise indicates the connection of art to other forms of thought. His inquiry, however, is concerned primarily with the problems of form and function in art. He could not have chosen more wisely. Perhaps one of the reasons for the confusion so prevalent in our understanding of art today lies in our uncertainty as to the significance of the word 'form'. Professor Nahm, in showing that "The end of art is the establishment of a mood," has not only hit at those who stress skill and logic alone, but he also reveals the close kinship which exists in art executed for non-esthetic and esthetic ends.

All the participants in the symposium have crowded their thoughts into such small compass that the casual reader may find the reading difficult and yet its appeal must be especially to the general student rather than to the specialist. The physical organization of the book greatly increases this difficulty. The small print, widely spaced and enclosed by distracting lines, is particularly trying. No doubt there is something to be said for keeping a series uniform in appearance but when an arrangement has been adopted which is so bad as to hinder the flow of thought it should certainly be changed. The form might have advantages for certain works but here it is not only unsatisfactory but a pity to find a book on the theory of art so far from exemplifying the subject. Those who find their way through the book must be struck by the richness of the study of art and its potentiality as a force in drawing the various narrow paths of specialists into the great highway of thought which the Greeks opened to civilization so many years ago. It is not too much to say that in spite of the lack of unity the book as a whole is an important addition to the literature of the humanities.

WALTER READ HOVEY

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

History and Philosophy of Education, Ancient and Medieval. By FREDERICK EBY and CHARLES FLINN ARROWOOD. xvi, 966 pages, illustrated. Prentice-Hall, New York 1940 \$3.75

In the first chapter of their former work, *The Development of Modern Education*, these authors outlined our educational inheritance from antiquity and the Middle Ages. Now they give us a long volume on what they formerly treated in a few pages. This time they begin not with the Greeks but with primitive

man and his training. This is followed by chapters on the culture and education of the Egyptians and the Hebrews. Over a third of the book is taken up with Greek education, a proportion that seems very fair. This and the two chapters on Roman education are ably written. Subsequent sections treat sympathetically of Christian education and the various agencies engaged in the work from the earliest centuries down to the Revival of Learning. But even though the authors expanded a former chapter into a large book, there are still serious problems of condensation involved in attempting to treat the history and philosophy of education from primitive man down to the man of the Renaissance.

In a revised edition the authors will wish to correct the date given for the poet Lucilius (page 540), clearly an error, and the inconsistency as to the date when Roman citizenship was conferred on all freedmen in the Empire (520, 542). The introduction of words in Greek type in such a book as this, which will be read for the most part by students who know nothing of Greek, is of questionable value, especially when there are mistakes in these words. (See pages 191, 258, 268, 273, and two instances on 458, where there are errors of incorrect breathings, accents or spelling.) There are Latin errors on page 541 where *disciplinorum* should read *disciplinarum*; on page 628 where *De Principis* should read *De Principiis* and on page 763 where mention is made of *studia generale*. On page 835 there are mistakes in the German title of the first bibliographical item. There are two maps in the book, and these are decidedly unsatisfactory, being quite unreadable.

But these are only slight flaws and do not by any means destroy my impression that this is a decidedly worthwhile text and one that should be examined by those who fashion curricula for teachers. Such training is becoming more and more technical, and a survey of this kind will do much to sketch in the cultural background so frequently ignored in teacher preparation. If scholars lament the small space given to the great names of the past they should remember that there are lengthy bibliographies at the end of each of the twenty chapters where the student of the history and philosophy of education can find suggestions for further study.

KEVIN GUINAGH

EASTERN ILLINOIS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Die Wiener Handschrift zu Xenophons Anabasis. By ARNOLD SVENSSON. 51 pages. Gleerup, Lund 1940 (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1939-1940, III)

The Anabasis manuscript Codex Vindobonensis gr. 95 has been known long rather than favorably. Schenkl in 1868 published a few readings from it (Xenophontische

Studien), but expressed the opinion that to publish all the variants would be to amass a heap of chaff. Nevertheless, as L. Castiglioni observed in 1932 in his *Studi intorno alla storia del testo dell' Anabasi di Senofonte* (Memoirs of the Lombard Institute, Vol. 24, Milan), speaking, to be sure, of the Ambrosian mss *a* and *b*, "A future editor should arm himself with patience and though he could not accomplish important results, should undertake the hard labor of collating these Mss. (since) only so can the interrelations and the value of the lesser Mss. be determined." This altruistic task Svensson has undertaken so far as MS V (Vindobonensis) is concerned. He now publishes a collation of the first two books, with a selection from the later ones. (He has deposited a complete collation in the University Library at Lund). His original intention of including a collation of MS Bodleianus (D) he had to abandon "wegen der Zeitumstände."

The text of V, Svensson explains, is all in one hand, and the scholia, interlinear notes and variants are in the same hand, though written subsequently. In a very few cases traces of a later hand can be distinguished, using a blue ink; the MS is in brown.

The collation is based on Hude's *Editio Maior* (Leipzig 1931). But absurd readings, slips of the pen (reine Verschreibungen), iotacisms and elisions or non-elisions of the vowel in δέ are not noted. (Since, however, the idiosyncrasies of a scribe are important to textual students, it would have been preferable to include even absurdities.) Bodleianus is compared sparingly, since Svensson is dependent on Hude and Marchant for it, and does not find them as trustworthy as Dindorf. On one occasion he characterizes a statement in the critical apparatus of Marchant as "false"; in another place he remarks that although Hude and Marchant describe an erasure of two letters in V and suggest ἀπ, the actual erasure is "of more than two letters," and he would read τούτων, assuming the usual abbreviation for ον. But on the whole he approves of Hude's editing. For example, (Anabasis 6.3.18) Hude reads ὥς in a passage where five mss (not including V, by the way) have ὥστε, but remarks in the apparatus, ὥστε, nescio an recte. Agreeing cordially, Svensson declares that ὥστε, though in such a passage it would be a poetical usage, "suits very well the solemn tone of the passage," in which Xenophon assures the soldiers that they are in the hands of the gods. As to the fact that the usage is not to be found elsewhere in Xenophon, he observes that this is unimportant, because it is well known that single instances of a poetic use of a word or phrase are not uncommon in Xenophon. And finally, "Ausserdem ist es als *lectio difficilior* zu betrachten." All this is well said; possibly Hude had not thought of so many reasons for his rather noncommittal "*nescio an recte*."

As to the final importance of MS V, Svensson is frank enough. Relatively few readings peculiar to V, he ad-

mits, can be regarded as 'lectiones probabiles', and even among those there are none which demand incorporation in the text, though it is interesting to note that a few are identical with conjectural readings of the older critics (Cobet, for instance). Modern editorial references to V are shown to have been inexact; Castiglioni seems occasionally to have nodded, Marchant perhaps oftener, and as for Schenkl, his collation, we are told, seems to have been conducted "offenbar nicht mit allzu grosser Sorgfalt." One wonders in what language the late A. E. Housman would have conveyed this idea!

Any future editor will be obliged, I think, to accept the conclusion that, despite conspicuous dissimilarities, V unmistakably belongs to the same MS group as Bodleianus and the two Ambrosian MSS. In fact, Svensson records more than 90 readings peculiar to these four, among them cases of omission, of additions, and of transpositions. Certainly these cannot be due to coincidence.

BEN C. CLOUGH

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Foundations of Language. By LOUIS H. GRAY. xvi, 530 pages, 9 figures. Macmillan, New York 1939 \$7.50

We have here the fruits of the author's study of linguistics for many years; and in fact the volume covers the linguistic field with greater completeness than does any other volume with which I am acquainted. It includes a general survey of language and linguistics, a definition of language, discussions of the physiological, the mental, and the social aspects of language; and of course, morphology, syntax, semantics, etymology, a classification of languages and a summary description of each group and of its important languages and linguistic features, and an historical account of the study of language. Bibliographical references are abundant, but are inserted in the text itself, where they receive a brief evaluation. Technical terms are used in abundance, but are interpreted at their first occurrence, which may usually be found in the Index (461-530). It is a storehouse of information.

In his preface (vii) the author states that the volume "is not planned for the technical linguist alone, or merely for students in secondary schools, colleges, or universities who may be interested in language, but also for the cultivated public in general who may desire to know something of a phenomenon without which thought itself would be well-nigh impossible." It is therefore our privilege to seek to determine whether the book is adapted to this triple audience.

Three features stand out as impressing me: first, the fact that words and forms are quoted from some two hundred languages, spoken in every part of the world

(vii). To any but the most advanced scholar, citations from unfamiliar languages are bewildering rather than enlightening, and I cannot but regard this use of languages unknown to the reader as a defect rather than a merit. Unquestionably the reader of limited linguistic range must be introduced to words from strange languages, but why present ten words for 'tree' from different Indo-European languages, three from Semitic languages, and still another from Turkish (14-15), to show that there is no intrinsic reason why the English word 'tree' has the meaning which it does? [Incidentally, in this connection (15 line 1), the term 'connotation' is used for 'denotation'.] Enough is enough, and too much is less good; and this type is illustrated quite often.

Second: the terminology is needlessly technical, even though the terms are defined at their first use. Thus the term 'epithetologue' is used (169; cited as 167 in the Index) to include noun (i.e., substantive) and adjective; something simpler might have been found, perhaps 'epithet' or 'case-declinable'. The term 'allogeneous' (not in the Index) is used (329, 332, 343), apparently as an opposite to 'indigenous', though 329.19-20 makes one suspect that it is equivalent to 'alien' (though not in the meaning defined 131.25-6). The New English Dictionary (Oxford) gives *allogeneous* as 'of different nature, diverse in kind', with *allogenous* as an incorrect spelling; the latest Webster gives only *allogeneous* 'different in nature or kind'. Why not use the conventional 'loanword'? Deglutination (48), which means 'act of ungluing', is used for deglutition or 'act of swallowing'. Other examples could be cited, but these suffice to show that the language is unduly difficult.

Third: the author often accepts solutions of problems which must be considered as still sub judice, and even incapable of definite solution. For example, he assigns to the pronoun (175) a high value in developing the case system of the noun—and this must be looked upon with great reserve.

Now the first two points indicate to me that the general reader and the not-too-advanced student will find Gray's book difficult reading, and hard to assimilate even when read with care; and the third point shows that such readers may be led to believe dubious doctrines. And I regret this the more, that there are numerous formulations, set in italics for conspicuousness, that are extremely valuable: examples chosen at random are the two on page 178, that on 179, that on 235, those on 251, 252, 255, and especially those on 279. I regret that the valid formulations on linguistic relationship on 279 are considerably contradicted by the primacy given to the wave-theory of Johannes Schmidt, page 42.

I now take up Gray's utilization of Latin, a discussion of which would be more convincing to the readers

of CLASSICAL WEEKLY than that of his use of most other languages.

He remarks (ix) that "Latin quantities have seldom been marked except when necessary for etymological reasons," wherein he follows a bad policy: the proper way is either to mark no quantities at all in Latin words, or to mark all long vowels except when sentences or other reasonably complete grammatical units are cited. His practice is therefore one which tends to confuse a Latinist who is not too sure of his quantities, and to annoy him who knows them. Even on his own formulation, however, Gray should have placed the macron over the second vowel in (nom. pl.) *hostes* (69.15), over the first *u* in **sumtus* (since this is a hypothetical form, 71.25; properly **sūmtos*, without the vowel weakening in the final syllable); and elsewhere.

His use of Latin and other Italic material is not always accurate. He quotes *videbat* (98.16) as meaning 'he saw repeatedly, he used to see', emphasizing the idea of repetition, but neglects the equally common meaning 'he was seeing'. He repeatedly has nom. *amōr* (151.5-7, 18, 22, 25 [the *o* is short]), nom. pl. *amōres* (the *e* is long) beside dat. sg. *amōri* (which shows that he intends to mark the quantities in the inflectional endings), 3d sg. *amāt* (which has short *a*). Gray cites *can-t-ō* as formed from the root in *can-ō* by addition of a root-determinative *t* (156.7); but *cantō* is a denominative verb, formed on the participial stem *canto-*. *Amātūriō* (156.13) really has a short *u*; it is a poor example, since it is quotable only from the grammarians Diomedes (fourth century) and Priscian (about 500 A.D.). *Quatuor-decim* (162.26) should have two *t*'s. *Posci-nummius* should be glossed 'ask-money', rather than 'want-money', to develop the meaning 'avaricious' (164.30); the *s-* of *super* is said to be by analogy with *sub* (171.4-5), but cognates in other languages do not show original *s* in *sub*, either.

To develop the use of Latin *quod* as a conjunction, he quotes Terence (HT 888), *gnatus quod se adsimulat lactum*, with the interpretation 'knowing that he pretends to be happy' (172.4-6); but *gnatus* does not mean 'knowing'. It means 'son', and the clause is followed by *id dicis*: the whole meaning 'That my son is only pretending he's happy—are you saying this?' He omits *is ea id* from the list of Latin pronouns of the third person (173-4). He takes such a collective singular as *familia* to be originally a neuter plural which later became a feminine singular (176): in doing so he reverses the generally accepted development of the neuter plural form, as being a collective feminine singular functioning in meaning as the plural of some other singular, and then ultimately as a neuter plural, if the singular noun happened to be a neuter. The collective singulars might be attached to masculine singulars, like *familia* to *famulus*, as well as to words of other

genders. When he instances *servitia* (176.13) as 'collectivity of servants', he overlooks that this word as a collective was first used in the singular, as in Plautus, and in the plural from Cicero's time onward. To contrast the *familia* with the *servitia* is also a wrong interpretation, since the *familia* included the slaves as well as the freeborn of the household; in Oscan *famel* meant *servus*, and there is no real distinction between *famulus* and *servus* in Latin. *Vi-ginti* 'twenty' is said to be a compound meaning 'two tens' (181.6-7); correct, but his pre-form, beginning with *dw-*, is impossible, for *d* is not present in this word in Greek and in Indo-Iranian, and initial *dw-* in Latin would become *b-*, as in *bis* from **dwis*. *Littora* (193) in Aeneid 1.3 is incorrect for *litora*, and *Lavinia littora* means not 'the shores of Lavinia', who was a woman, but 'the Lavinian shores, the shores named after Lavinia'.

He takes the genitive ending *-i* of the second declension as a reduced grade of the *-ei* or *-oi* which appears as a dative ending (195): to my mind a quite impossible solution of a difficult problem. He quotes Oscan *aserum eizazunc egmazum* 'to make seizure involving these matters' (198.13) as example of a generic genitive (I am not quite clear what he means by the term!), but the Oscan is *manim aserum eizazunc egmazum*, wherein *manim* 'manum' is essential, and I fail to see why it does not mean 'to lay hand on = make seizure of those things' which are described in the following relative clause. He adopts a very dubious theory of the origin of the ending of the ablative case (198-9), rejecting by implication that propounded by Sturtevant in Language 8.1-10. He cites, as examples of formations which contrast the iterative or frequentative and the intensive aspects of the verb (207), *si-st-ō* 'I make to stand' and *stō* 'I stand'; but *sistō* is not infrequently intransitive, in all periods of Latin literature, and in its compounds always has the meaning 'stand'. He seems (209.12-3, 210.12) to combine the Sanskrit imperative ending *-tu* with the Greek *-τω* and the Latin *-tō*, regarding the *t* as the personal ending before a particle *-ōu*, varying with *u* (and with *-ou* in Gothic *-au*); he overlooks the old Latin forms in *-tōd*, which cannot be explained from his starting point, nor can the use of the *-tō* forms as second persons in Latin be explained on his basis. The citation of *cum telo* 'with a weapon' as an ablative with *cum* replacing an instrumental (241) is misleading, since *cum telo* could only mean 'with a weapon (in his hand)', not 'by means of a weapon'. To show the original meaning of *periculum* 'experiment, trial, attempt, proof' (267.1) he cites Terence, Eun. 476, *fac periculum in litteris*, and glosses it 'try writing!', whereas it actually means 'give him an examination in literature'. He has the wrong sequence of sound changes (283.16-7) in the development of *ager* from **agros* (becoming, properly, **agrs* with vocalic *r*, then **agers* **agerr* *ager*). Umbrian

dersa 'let him give' is said to be from **dedet* (286) but is really from **didāt*. He seems to regard the division of Indo-European languages into *centum* and *satem* languages as a genetic division (310-1), instead of merely a rule of thumb, portraying the situation at the date at which we make our acquaintance with the earliest records of the languages (in some of the *satem* languages the assibilation of the original palatal stops is evidently a fairly recent development).

Perhaps this is enough, or even too much. I must refrain from setting forth my notes on other matters. On bibliography, however, I must note that he gives too little on Lithuanian (354-5), passes by the fundamental studies of Benveniste and his pupils in Avestan (321), and bestows too high praise on The Century Dictionary of 1895 as the best work on English etymology (352). He says also that to the ancients the term analogy meant what we call phonetic correspondences (424), but it really meant merely regularity and uniformity in the paradigms.

I cannot stop here and leave the impression that I condemn the book in toto. The volume suffers from the defects of its author's merits: no scholar can know a really great number of languages intimately, and he who attempts to utilize too many languages in his magnum opus runs the risk of inaccuracies in the utilization, for precisely this reason. What I do like about my friend's book—for Gray is a dear friend of mine—is a certain sureness of touch in his general formulations, a matter that I mentioned above; and I

would call attention here to certain other passages: the great vistas opened by linguistic study (10-11); his wording that "languages are evolutions, not creations," with its corollary on international languages (36); his formulation of what a 'good' language is (41); his confident verdict on the paramount value of phonetic law for linguistics (82-3); his attitude on governmental regulation of minority languages (119); his statement on the learning of the syntax of new languages (225).

And so my conclusion is not to be expressed in a single phrase. The tyro may read certain chapters with ease, like those on Language and Society and on Semantics, but will find others extremely hard going; the advanced scholar will find much, even an immense amount, that will be valuable to him, but must read and digest with a critical reserve. The intermediate student—well, he is intermediate. One may as well frankly admit that no book can be well suited to all three clienteles. He who wishes to make a test—*facere periculum*—of this for himself, should read thoughtfully Bloomfield's *Language* (1933) and Pedersen's *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century* (1931; translated by Spargo), as well as Gray's *Foundations of Language*, and he can draw his own inferences. But I would warn him that the volume which he reads first will seem more difficult than it really is, and that which he reads third will seem easier than it is, because of his own changing attainments during the process.

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Norman T. Pratt, Jr., of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

For microprint or photoprint copies of articles abstracted send 1c per page for microprint, or 10c per page for photoprint, plus a service charge of 20c for each item, to Bibliofilm Service, Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D. C. The Service reserves the right to except material readily available elsewhere.

Caesar. GÜNTHER JACHMANN. *Caesartext und Caesarinterpolation*. Present editors are unwise in restoring to our text of the De Bello Gallico many passages rightly bracketed by Meusel. New objections are raised against 1.2.3-4 (una ex parte . . . afficiebantur) and suspicion for the first time is directed at 6.21.5 (cuius rei . . . nuda). The latter has been falsely worked up from 4.1.10 (note a corruption in 6.21.4 caused by a similar expression in 4.1.9); the former is seen to depend in part on a corruption in the text at 4.3.1. RhM 89 (1940) 161-88 (Heller)

Homer. G. BJÖRCK. ΗΕΙΡΑΡ. Homer uses this form of the word three times: Il. 13.359, 18.501, Od. 5.289. The true sense of the word in these passages is the primary one, 'end' or 'extremity'; a figurative interpretation such as 'cord' or 'knot' cannot be allowed. Mélanges Boissacq 1.143-8 (Upson)

— P. CHANTRAINE. *Grec μελίχιος*. The numerous family of words represented in Homer by the de-

rivatives μελίσσω, μέλιχος, and μελίχιος presents an etymological problem incapable of certain solution. The popular etymology μέλι is phonetically and semantically excluded, but there is a favorable connection between the epithets applied to the gods and the honey offered to them.

Mélanges Boissacq 1.169-74

(Upson)

— JOSEPH E. FONTENROSE. *On the Particle ΠΩ in Homer*. The particle is always temporal in meaning. οὐπω never means 'in no wise', but always 'not yet'. AJPh 62 (1941) 65-79 (De Lacy)

Horace. FRANK O. COPLEY. *Horace, Odes, 3, 5, 13-18*. *exemplo trahere* = *ad exemplum trahere*, a legal phrase meaning 'to set a precedent'. AJPh 62 (1941) 87-9 (De Lacy)

Longinus. WALTER ALLEN, JR. *The Terentianus of the ΗΕΡΕΥΦΟΥΣ*. This famous work was written at Rome by a native of Greece, or perhaps Asia, at the request of a Roman of high rank. It was intended to be a practical guide to the high style of oratory. AJPh 62 (1941) 51-64 (De Lacy)

Pliny the Elder. A. C. MOORHOUSE. *A Roman's View of Art*. Examines Pliny's attitude toward art and its appreciation as being that of a "typical Roman." The conclusion is that his aesthetic sense was not highly developed. G&R 10 (1940) 29-35 (Vlachos)

Terence. HANS OPPERMAN. *Zur Entwicklung der Fabula Palliata.* Caecilius, probably in his prologues, established two rules for the fabula palliata. First, the same Greek original should not be presented more than once on the Roman stage, and second, contaminatio was proscribed. A study of the Terentian prologues shows that Terence was defending himself against charges brought by Lucius Lanuvinus that he violated both rules. Terence abided by the first Caecilian rule but successfully upheld the practice of contaminatio.
H 74 (1939) 113-29 (Kirk)

Thucydides. W. MEINERS. *Zu Thukydides.* Suggests εἰγώνιοι for ἐγγώνιοι in description of wall at 1.93.5; explains other points in passage.
RhM 89 (1940) 239-40 (Heller)

LINGUISTICS. GRAMMAR. METRICS

ADJARIAN, H. *De l'Affinité du Grec et de l'Arménien.* The affinity of Greek and Armenian is revealed by the words and forms lacking in both languages as well as by those possessed in common.
Mélanges Boisacq 1.3-4 (Upson)

BARTOLI, M. *Rapporti cronologici tra forme greche e forme di aree vicine: i tipi ἡ ἴππος e latino 'equa.'* Latin and the languages of other countries bordering on Greece often preserve Indo-European forms better than does the Greek, which is rich in primitive innovations; some of these probably originated with an ancient non-Aryan culture of Asia Minor.
Mélanges Boisacq 1.19-30 (Upson)

BENVENISTE, E. *Noms d'armes orientaux en grec.* The Greeks borrowed words for weapons from their warlike neighbors. τόξον and γοργυρός are words of early Iranian provenance which came into pre-Homeric Greek via the Scythian language.
Mélanges Boisacq 1.37-46 (Upson)

BERTOLDI, V. **KYPHNH.** Etymologies of place names. κυρήνη: 'where asphodel abounds', is of Libyan origin. The Mediterranean world abounds in place names consisting of a stem plus the suffix -νη or -ena. The stem often indicates some local topographical feature, often floral. The genesis of these names is prehistoric.
Mélanges Boisacq 1.47-63 (Upson)

BESCHEWLEW, W. *Zur Frage des Lautwertes des Buchstaben B im Spätgriechischen.* The pronunciation of the ancient Greek letter B did not everywhere become V in later times. The original sound was often retained in words borrowed by adjacent peoples (e.g., the Slavs, Armenians).
Mélanges Boisacq 1.65-68 (Upson)

GREINDL, MAX FR. *Zum Ruhmes- und Ehrbegriff bei den Vorsokratikern.* Extends his study (diss. München, 1938) of the usage in epic and lyric poetry of certain words denoting 'fame' and 'honor' to the usage of the pre-Socratics. The latter is closely dependent on the former, but a few new tendencies appear.
RhM 89 (1940) 216-28 (Heller)

HAHN, E. ADELAIDE. *Quintilian on Greek Letters Lacking in Latin and Latin Letters Lacking in Greek* (12.10.27-29). The Greek letters are upsilon and zeta; the Latin, f and consonant u. Moreover, Quintilian has wrongly been thought to have said that Greek phi was transliterated by Latin f.
Lang 17 (1941) 24-32 (Gummere)

KRAHE, HANS. Volcei—Eine etruskische Siedlung in Lukanien? The name of the Etruscan city (Volci) and

that of the Lucanian (above) are indeed related, but the evidence of derivatives in -nt- built on this stem and on others, notably *Vei-*, shows that these, both stems and derivatives, are Illyrian. Hence Volcei was not an Etruscan 'island' in Lucania, but Illyrian, as was the Etruscan Volci.

RhM 89 (1940) 188-94

(Heller)

RADERMACHER, L. Xoῖπος 'Mädchen'? Suggests that xoῖπος, whatever else it may mean in Ar. Ach. 750ff., was also applied to girls as a term of endearment.
RhM 89 (1940) 236-8 (Heller)

STURTEVANT, EDGAR H. *The Indo-European Voiceless Aspirates.* Indo-Hittite had four laryngeal consonants: (1) a glottal stop of palatal color; (2) a glottal stop of velar color; (3) a voiceless velar spirant; (4) a voiced velar spirant. Any one of the first three laryngeals converted an immediately preceding voiceless stop into the corresponding voiceless aspirate in Primitive Indo-European.
Lang 17 (1941) 1-11 (Gummere)

WHORF, BENJAMIN LEE. *Linguistics as an Exact Science.* An ingenious and highly instructive description of modern work in linguistic science. Three diagrams are included: Structural formula of the monosyllabic word in English; Variables and alternates illustrating specifically how English final -s is actualized in any given case by one of four alternates, i.e., in this instance, the sounds which immediately precede it; Flow sheet of improved process for learning French, in which the procedures whereby English sound-pattern and form-pattern are broken up and remodeled into the corresponding French patterns are cleverly illustrated.
Technology Review 43 (1940) 61ff. (Gummere)

EPIGRAPHY. NUMISMATICS. PAPYROLOGY

BIKERMAN, E. *Sur une inscription grecque de Sidon.* B. discusses an inscription from Sidon (Waddington-Lebas 1866a=Kaibel 932) celebrating the victory of a citizen of that city in the chariot race at the Nemean Games. The epigram, dating from ca. 200 B.C., is interesting as evidence of the progress of hellenization in the Phoenician cities at the close of the third century. The Semitic character of the victor's title δικαστής is commented upon.
Mélanges Dussaud 1.91-9 (Gilliam)

CANTINEAU, JEAN. *La Susiane dans une inscription palmyrénienne.* A fragmentary Palmyrene inscription of the second-half of the second century, in which Susa is mentioned.
Mélanges Dussaud 1.227-9 (Gilliam)

LITERARY HISTORY. CRITICISM

BIDEZ, J. *Le nom et les Origines de nos Almanachs.* Eusebius in his Praeparatio evangelica III.4 quotes a fragment of a letter of Porphyry in which he mentions Ἀλμεινχιακοῖς, the ancestors of our almanac. Iamblichus in a reply to the epistle of Porphyry calls these astrological ephemerides Σαλμεινχιακοῖς. The testimony of papyrus fragments of these calendars bears witness to the correctness of the form Σαλμεινχιακόν. This is doubtless the word Porphyry used; Eusebius' scribes were in error. In twelfth-century mediaeval MSS the word appears in the indeclinable form *almanach* or *almanak*; the humanists were the first to use *almanachus*. The etymology of the word is to be sought through the pseudo-Arabic form *almanakh* to the Syriac l-manḥai.

Mélanges Boisacq 1.77-85

(Upson)